

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 11, 2008, claims 1-10 were rejected. Additionally, the specification and drawings were objected to. In response, claims 1, 3, 5, and 10 have been amended. Additionally, claim 2 has been canceled and claim 11 has been added. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims, the added claims, and the below-provided remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The abstract was objected to as not being on a separate sheet apart from any other text. Additionally, the title was objected to as not being descriptive. In response, the abstract has been included in a separate sheet apart from any other text. Additionally, the title has been amended to be more descriptive. In view of the amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that the blank boxes of figures 1 and 5, in particular, boxes 101 and 501, need descriptive labels. The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The labeling of figures with text matter is prohibited under PCT Rule 11.11, except when absolutely indispensable for understanding. Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that “[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11).” In the present application, Applicants submit that the addition of text labels to the drawings is not “absolutely indispensable” because the individual drawing elements are identified by reference numbers and described in the specification. In view of the above rules, Applicants respectfully assert that additional descriptive labels are not required in the drawings of the current application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Brokaw (U.S. Pat. No. 5,917,311). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Brokaw for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 2. As amended, claim 1 recites

“A voltage regulator circuit arrangement comprising a voltage regulator for generating an output voltage in dependence of a reference signal, characterized in that a reference signal generation circuit is provided for generating said reference signal comprising a plurality of inputs connected to internal terminals, whereby a sub-set of said plurality internal terminals is connected to an external terminal and said reference signal generation circuit comprises a selection circuit for selecting said reference signal out of a range of possible reference signals in dependence upon a selection signal received at said external terminal.” (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose that the reference signal generation circuit comprises “a selection circuit for selecting said reference signal out of a range of possible reference signals in dependence upon a selection signal received at said external terminal” as recited in amended claim 1.

In particular, Brokaw does not disclose that a reference signal is generated by selecting from “a range of possible reference signals” as recited in amended claim 1. Brokaw discloses a reference voltage (V_{ref}), see FIG. 2 and the paragraph between column 2 line 66 and column 3 lines 12. However, Brokaw does not disclose that the reference voltage (V_{ref}) is generated by selecting from “a range of possible reference signals” as recited in amended claim 1. Additionally, Brokaw does not disclose that a reference signal is generated “in dependence upon a selection signal received at said external terminal” as recited in amended claim 1. Brokaw discloses an external terminal, from which an output voltage (V_{out}) is output, see FIGs. 2-4. However, Brokaw does not disclose that a selection signal received at the external terminal affects the generation of the reference voltage (V_{ref}).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Brokaw.

Dependent Claims 3-9

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that although the Office Action mentioned that claims 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being

anticipated by Brokaw, the Office Action did not provide specific support for the rejections of claims 3-9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provides specific support for the rejections of claims 3-9 in a subsequent Office Action.

Claims 3 and 5 have been amended to reflect the claim dependency changes. Claims 3-9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claim 3 and claim 4 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 3 recites in part that “*said reference signal generation circuit comprises a comparator with an input connected to an internal terminal out of said sub-set of internal terminals for comparing said selection signal with a threshold signal and an output connected to said selection circuit*”. Although Brokaw discloses that an amplifier (50) compares a feedback voltage (V_{fb}) with a reference voltage (V_{ref}), see the paragraph between column 2 line 66 and column 3 lines 12, Brokaw does not disclose that a comparator connects with an internal terminal and a selection circuit of a reference signal generation circuit and compares a selection signal of the selection circuit with a threshold signal. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 3.

Claim 4 recites in part that “*said reference signal generation circuit comprises a further comparator with an input connected to a further internal terminal out of said sub-set of internal terminals for comparing said selection signal with a further threshold signal and an output connected to said selection circuit*.” Although Brokaw discloses that an amplifier (50) compares a feedback voltage (V_{fb}) with a reference voltage (V_{ref}), see the paragraph between column 2 line 66 and column 3 lines 12, Brokaw does not disclose that two comparators connect with internal terminals and a selection circuit of a reference signal generation circuit and compare a selection signal of the selection circuit with two threshold signals. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 4.

Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to particularly point out that the reference signal generation circuit includes “a selection circuit for selecting said reference signal out of a range of possible reference signals in dependence upon a selection signal received at an external terminal of said integrated circuit.” Support for the amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, claim 2. As amended, claim 10 includes similar limitations to amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 10, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 10 is not anticipated by Brokaw.

New Claim 11

Claim 11 has been added. Support for claim 11 is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, claim 3 and claim 10. Claim 11 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim 10. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 11 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10. Additionally, claim 11 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 11 recites in part that “said reference signal generation circuit comprises a comparator with an input connected to an internal terminal out of a sub-set of internal terminals of the integrated circuit for comparing said selection signal with a threshold signal and an output connected to said selection circuit.” Although Brokaw discloses that an amplifier (50) compares a feedback voltage (V_{fb}) with a reference voltage (V_{ref}), see the paragraph between column 2 line 66 and column 3 lines 12, Brokaw does not disclose that a comparator connects with an internal terminal and a selection circuit of an integrated circuit and compares a selection signal of the selection circuit with a threshold signal. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Brokaw does not disclose all the limitations of claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 21, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111